



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Townsend Building
401 Federal Street Suite 2
Dover, Delaware 19901-3639
DOE WEBSITE: <http://www.doe.k12.de.us>

Susan S. Bunting, Ed.D.
Secretary of Education
Voice: (302) 735-4000
FAX: (302) 739-4654

PUBLIC MEETING: DPAS-II Advisory Committee Meeting

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Wednesday, March 28, 2017 – 10:00 am

PLACE: Delaware Department of Education

401 Federal Street, Dover, DE 19901 - 2nd Floor Cabinet Room

Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sherry Antonetti

Wendy Whitehurst represented Susan Frampton
Representative Earl Jaques, Jr.

Jill League

Max Rodriguez

Jennifer Smith, Chair

Senator David Sokola

David Tull

TJ Vari, Co-Chair

Donna Johnson, State Board of Education Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member

Laura Schneider, DDOE Representative Non-Voting Member

Kimberly Rodriguez, DDOE Administrative support

MEMBERS ABSENT

Matthew Burrows

Dr. Cecil Clark

Susan Frampton

Suzette Marine

Meghan Wallace

PUBLIC

Seher Ahmad, DDOE

Antre Alleyne, Delaware Can

Kelley Brake, DDOE

Tammy Croce, DASA

Raifu Durodoye, DDOE

Melissa Oates, DDOE

Angeline Rivello, DDOE

Maria Stecker, DDOE

Deborah Stevens, DSEA

Secretary Susan Bunting, DOE

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of February 23, 2017 Agenda

Jill League motioned and Representative Jaques seconded the motion to approve the February 23, 2017 agenda. **The motion passed.**

4. Approval of February 23, 2017 Minutes

Representative Jaques motioned and Jill League seconded to approve the February 23, 2017 minutes. **The motion passed.**

Representative Jaques asked about a breakout during the meeting. Laura Schneider asked to have a private discussion about this due to individual districts called out. Jill League commented that she would like to see the document without the districts. Changes were made to the document to reflect a/b/c/d instead of district names.

5. DPAS II Equal Weighting Models

Laura Schneider commented that as per HB399 Equal Weighting starts in the 2017-2018 school year. Laura shared three models of how Equal Weighting could possibly work.

Model 1 was presented and is based on the DSEA/DASA model (with revised summative thresholds) recommended by the committee in the previous year. This model uses averages of criteria and component level scores to determine a summative rating.

The second model is similar to the first but uses professional judgement and the preponderance of evidence to determine component level scores, rather than the average of criteria level ratings.

Model 3 also has each component rated based on the preponderance of evidence. Each component level rating is given a numeric value and the sum all of points determines the summative rating.

Component 5 – Student Improvement Component has only three levels of performance (Un-sat, SAT and Exceeds). In order to do equal weighting Component 5 is broken into four levels of performance (highly effective, effective, needs improvement, and in effective).

Comments and discussions were given on Model 1, 2 and 3. Comments were stated that Model 3 is similar to Model 2 in that you are still rating and coming up with feedback and giving a rating. Model 2 uses an algorithm and may be more transparent.

Jill League ran a scenario showing that all four models need to be highly effective, not five.

Discussions were centered on multiple scenarios such as results in each of the models given by Jill League, Earl Jaques, Max Rodriguez and TJ Vari.

Laura Schneider commented that a 4/4/4/4 2 would be considered highly effective according to the Department of Education and mentioned that she would bring the asterisk to the department but not willing to bring 4/4/4/4/2 to the department.

Concerns were noted that there is a fine line being at the top of the rating and how to push the teacher to the next level?

Laura asked the Committee, do you want a mathematical algorithm or do you want professional judgement at the component level?

Comments were noted that they do not like giving ratings based on personalities.

Answers were given that Model 1 takes a lot of pressure off the administrators to give someone the benefit of the doubt and focuses on the skill.

Representative Jaques commented that it takes personalities out of the equation.

***TJ stepped out of the room at 10:45 and returned at 10:51*

***Senator Sokola stepped out of the room at 10:46 and returned at 10:49*

Earl Jaques commented that if you got 3.7 in three categories and 3.7 in two categories when you add them up it is 18.1 and it makes you highly effective and a 3.62 average.

Jill League commented that she would like to see the numbers run before the model is implemented.

Laura mentioned that she needs to start writing policy and changes are needed on 106a/107a/108a.

Comments were noted that Model 1 and 3 are the best.

***Representative Jaques stepped out of the room at 10:59*

Questions were asked about the department's preference of model. Laura mentioned that the department did not have a strong preference.

TJ Vari asked if there are any other models that have not been thought about.

Senator Sokola added that they had 8 different types. Everyone had an improvement plan. You needed to have an area to improve.

Laura mentioned the department needs a path for equal weighting.

Votes for Model's 1, 2 and 3:

1. Max Rodriguez made a motion to vote on Model #1 and seconded by Senator Sokola. Earl Jaques-Yes, Sherri Antonetti-Yes, David Tull-Yes =
5 Yes / 3 No / 1 Abstained. The motion passed.
2. Jill league made a motion to vote Model #2, being accepted to the equal weighting scale and seconded by Mr. Rodriguez.
2 Yes / 6 No / 1 Abstention. The motion failed.
3. TJ Vari motioned to make a recommendation to present Model #3 to Secretary Bunting and seconded by Jill League.
8 Yes / 0 No / 1 Abstention. The motion passed.

Laura Schneider will discuss the recommendations for Model's 1, 2 and 3 with Secretary Bunting.

****Senator Sokola left the meeting at 11:40. A quorum is no longer available to continue discussing or voting on the agenda items.**

****Representative Jaques and Max Rodriguez left at 11:43.**

Public Comment

- Antre Alleyne, Director of Delaware Can and Delaware Achieve commented on the diversity the committee. Feels like the committee should work to address the representation of color because we are representing a diverse set of students throughout the State.

A comment was also noted that every Delawarean should be able to engage in the policy process. The times of the meetings are inaccessible for people to engage and should be taken in to consideration so others may attend.

Mr. Alleyne would also like to know what the criteria is used to make the decisions on the models. Mr. Alleyne investigated the DASA/DSEA cut points from last year, and mentioned that there were serious concerns of students not learning or growing in the class and still

rated with high ratings. Encourages more investigation as this is ultimately about the students. If students are not growing and learning, the models do not mean anything.

- Tammy Croce, Executive Director for Delaware Association of School Administrators thanked the Committee for the conversations, felt that everyone was respectful of each other's ideas and opinions, and felt good about the outcome of the decisions that were made on the three models. Tammy mentioned that she feels Model 3 a good model and allows for more discretion in issues than Model 1. She also likes that the model allows student and teacher growth. Tammy feels that Model 3 allows for seeing the teacher growth and shows that the teachers worked hard to get there. Kudos to the group and is in support of Model 3.
- Deb Stevens, Director of Instruction Advocacy for DSEA commended the group for the hard work on the models and commented on what a teacher's performance looks like. DSEA is very comfortable supporting Model 3 because it gives a degree of professionalism judgement to the Principal, takes it another step away from being a mathematical configuration, and looks at a holistic model of performance. The groups that met prior, representatives from DASL, DSEA and the districts agreed that it should be looking holistically at the performance of the educator and noted that accountability was still important but ultimately looking at the performance of the educator. Feels that Model 3 brings you the closest to what was mentioned and still brings you to a summative score in a fair and balanced way. You will still have the ability to work on this next year after seeing how it works and what challenges it brings. Kudos to the Committee.
- TJ Vari asked if there would be interest in looking at a different system to develop a plan to see how it would look for the State. TJ mentioned that the committee has been discussing DPAS and the guide is 127 pages on the teacher's side with a lot of items that need to be changed. The system is also based on the Danielson Model that was not supposed to be an evaluation system. Danielson has their own evaluation system. The committee has come a long way with online platforms and adopted some numerical rating systems. There are systems that are tied to professional growth and professional development. The group could come back with a plan to develop a system based on interest, rubrics and core values that the group comes up with in a teacher evaluation system. The committee could also bring in different comprehensive off the shelf systems from different groups. These groups have the flexibility for the State and LEA's to select parts of the system. A year or two could be spent devising a plan and working on it for implementation using DPAS II. Year 3 could be spent training teachers, administrators and staff in the use of the system before going live. A pilot is not being suggested and would like to recommend this to the Secretary. Feels that this is better than what is currently being done.
- Donna Johnson commented that the State Board presented some research that had been done over the last two years. Options were presented that were done throughout States

across the country and brought forth the recommendation that the State may want to take a deep dive and look at some rubrics. This recommendation was brought forth over a year ago. The State Board has had conversations asking is this the best system that we have for the expectations of student learning and does it reflect our expectations of professional growth? The State Board has the ability and can assist in bringing the researcher back if the committee wants to work on the plan.

6. Adjournment

Jennifer Smith motioned and TJ Vari seconded that the meeting adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

DRAFT